

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

A.D. ARMSTRONG,	:	
	:	NO. 1:12-CV-00132
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
	:	
v.	:	ORDER
	:	
	:	
TIM BRUNSMAN, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	


This matter is before the Court on the August 16, 2012 Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (doc. 39), in which she recommends that Plaintiff's construed motion to amend his complaint (doc. 26) and his motion to amend/correct his complaint to dismiss Defendants (doc. 31) be denied.

Plaintiff timely filed what he styled "Plaintiff's Objections to the Magistrate Report and Recommendation" (doc. 46). However, those objections are not responsive to the Magistrate Judge's August 16, 2012 Report and Recommendation. Rather than objecting to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation regarding his motions to amend, Petitioner presents arguments regarding Respondents' pending motion to revoke Petitioner's in forma pauperis status, and he asserts that Respondents are in default (doc. 46).

Because Petitioner's objections are not proper objections, specific to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the Court must merely satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. See Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72; Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150(1985). The Court finds no clear error. As required by 29 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the Court has reviewed the analysis of the Magistrate Judge and ADOPTS and AFFIRMS the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (doc. 39) in its entirety. Consequently, Plaintiff's construed motion to amend his complaint (doc. 26) and Plaintiff's motion to amend/correct his complaint to dismiss Defendants (doc. 31) are DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: 9/11/12



S. Arthur Spiegel
United States Senior District
Judge